

REMARKS

The courtesy of Examiner Castellano in granting a telephone interview on July 8, 2009 and his suggestions made during the interview are sincerely appreciated. The interview is summarized in an Interview Summary mailed by the Examiner on July 10, 2009.

Independent Claim 1 is amended to better point out the subject matter of the present invention by reciting that the ribs of the first wall component are thicker than the thickness of the web of the first wall component, as discussed during the interview.

Independent Claim 7 is amended to better point out the subject matter of the present invention by reciting that the ribs of the first wall component are thicker than the thickness of the web of the first wall component, and that the ribs of the second wall component are thicker than the thickness of the web of the second wall component, as also discussed during the interview.

Claim 7 is also amended to correct some inconsistency in terminology.

New dependent Claims 31 and 32 recite that the predominant thickness of the ribs of a wall component is thicker than the thickness of the web of the respective wall component.

Support for new claims 31 and 32 is provided by the Drawing. A recitation of such support is being inserted into the Specification at page 10, between lines 20 and 21.

The Summary of the Invention portion of the Specification is amended to be consistent with the scope of the amended independent claims.

The Detailed Description of the Specification is amended in paragraphs beginning on pages 4-6, 8, 9 and 12 to change "wider" to "thicker".

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

The rejection of Claims 1, 5-7, 9-12, 14-15 and 25-27 under 35 USC 102 (e) as being anticipated by Schafer is respectively traversed for at least the following reasons:

Schafer neither discloses nor suggests a ribbed component in which the ribs of the first wall component are thicker than the thickness of the web, as required by both of independent Claims 1 and 7.

It is submitted that the detent barbs 23 disposed upon the distal portion of some of Schafer's ribs are not portions of such ribs, but are merely supported by such ribs, whereby it is not reasonable to interpret Claims 1 and 7 so broadly as be anticipated by Schafer.

The rejection of Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 12, 15 and 25-26 under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by Burling is respectively traversed for at least the following reasons:

Burling neither discloses nor suggests a ribbed component in which the ribs of the first wall component are thicker than the thickness of the web, as required by both of independent Claims 1 and 7.

It is submitted that the triangular-shaped protrusions 32 disposed upon the distal portion of Burling's ribs 17 are not portions of the ribs 17, but are merely supported by the ribs 17, whereby it is not reasonable to interpret Claims 1 and 7 so broadly as be anticipated by Burling.

New Claims

New dependent Claims 31 and 32 are patentable over Schafer and Burling because there is no suggestion in either reference that the predominant thickness of any of the ribs of a wall component disclosed in either of these two references is thicker than the thickness of the web of the respective wall component.

Conclusion

Applicants do not necessarily agree with any of the Examiner's comments regarding the applicability of the cited references to any of the claims. However, in view of the reasons presented herein for traversing the rejections of the claims, applicants are not presenting additional arguments at this time. Applicants reserve the right to present additional arguments for traversing the present and any future rejections of the claims.

Reconsideration of Claims 1, 5-7, 9-12, 14-15 and 25-27, examination of new Claims 31 and 32 and allowance of all of the remaining claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated August 10, 2009



Edward W. Callan
Attorney for Applicants
Attorney Registration No. 24,720

Customer No. 22653
Telephone: (858) 259-5533
Facsimile: (858) 259-5537
Email: ecallan1@san.rr.com